

FILED
SCRANTON

JUL 05 2001

COPY

13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STEVEN L. ROMANSKY,

Petitioner

v.

CONNER BLAINE, JR.,

Respondent

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL NO. 3:CV-00-1520

(Judge Rambo)

NOTICE OF ELECTION

I, Steven Romansky, petitioner in the above-captioned action, have read the Order of Court which accompanied this form notice. Pursuant to that order, I elect to proceed in this action as follows:

_____ Option 1. - The Court should rule on my case as filed.

_____ Option 2. - Recharacterize and treat my case as a proceeding under 28 U.S.C. §2254. I realize that the law does not allow me to file successive or later petitions unless I receive certification to do so from the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

_____ Option 3. - I wish to withdraw my petition which was filed under 28 U.S.C. §2254 and file one all-inclusive petition; that is one that raises all the grounds I have. I realize this all-inclusive petition must be filed within the one year period as defined by 28 U.S.C. §2244(d).

Date: _____

Steven Romansky
Petitioner

I, Steven Romansky, petitioner in the above-captioned action have read the Order of Court which accompanied this Form notice and do not understand it for the following reasons:

1. I do not understand my options because I only filed one 28 U.S.C. section 2254.

2. I do not understand how United States v. Miller, 197 F.3d 844 (3d Cir. 1999) applies because Miller filed two post-conviction motions with the District Court. Id. at 847. I on the other hand only filed one.

3. I do not understand how I could file one all-inclusive petition if I only filed one in the first place.

Please clarify order dated May 29, 2001, and state why these options apply to me if I only filed one petition.

Dated: June 29, 2001

Steven Romansky